

REMARKS

In the Office communication mailed August 10, 2009, the Office states that applicant's May 27, 2009 Reply to Restriction Requirement was not fully responsive because applicant was first required to indicate whether or not the claimed method further comprises the administration of an anti-diabetic drug. Further, the Office notes that the election of a specific anti-diabetic drug is required. The Office asserts that "human insulin analogue," as elected by applicant in their May 27, 2009 Reply, is not a specific anti-diabetic drug, but rather a genus of anti-diabetic drugs. Finally, the Office has indicated that the format of claims 21 and 23 is not acceptable, and that claim 27 appears to have no antecedent basis in claim 1 (from which it depends). Each of these matters is addressed below.

Claim amendments

Claims 21, 27, 28, and 30 have been amended, and claim 23 has been cancelled. Claim 21 has been amended to recite particular GLP-1 analogs, including the elected species (Compound 1). Support for these analogs is found, for example, at page 17, line 19, through page 18, line 13, of the specification. Claims 27 and 28 have been amended to depend from claim 24, and claim 30 has been amended to depend from claim 29. These amendments add no new matter.

Restriction requirement

Applicant elects a method that includes administration of an anti-diabetic drug. As a species, applicant elects the Lys (B28) Pro (B29) human insulin. This election is made without traverse. Claims 1-22, 24-30, and 36-39, as amended, read on the elected species.


CONCLUSION

Applicant believes the application is condition for examination, and such action is respectfully requested. If there are any charges or any credits, please apply them to Deposit Account No. 03-2095.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

September 10, 2009



Kristina Bicker Brady, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 39,109

Clark & Elbing LLP
101 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: 617-428-0200
Facsimile: 617-428-7045